

REMARKS AND RESPONSES

Claims 1-7 have been amended particularly point out that the originally claimed structure of a light-shielding frame for a liquid crystal display panel is the structure surrounding all pixels thereof, rather than the black matrix surrounding each single pixel. Claim 13 has been amended for correcting grammatical error. Newly added claim 20 has been added particularly points out the structure of the color layer. It is submitted that these amendments do not constitute the addition of any new matter. As a result, claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-13 and 17-19 stand rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Manabu Sawasaki at al. (US 2004/0114081) (hereinafter referred to as “081”). Of the rejected claims, only claims 1 and 8 are independent.

After careful consideration of this reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully asserts that under the Law; “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). (MPEP §2131)

With such precedent in mind, Applicant makes particular reference to claims 1 and 8 of the present application, wherein the liquid crystal display panel comprises a display region and a frame region surrounding the display region. The display region is a region including all pixels in a liquid crystal display (LCD) panel. At least a color layer is formed on the frame region, and the color layer is used to prevent ambient light from projecting in to the display region and serves as a spacer.

Applicant would like to clarify the meaning of the black matrix mentioned in “081” interpreted by the Examiner as the “frame region”. The black matrix mentioned in “081” is in the border of each pixel. However, it is well known in the art that in the LCD panel, the “frame region” is a border region surrounding the display region, and the display region includes a plurality of pixels.

Referring to FIG. 5 of “081”, the liquid crystal display panel includes a frame region 40 surrounding a display area 38 (see paragraph [0072]). Therefore, the structure corresponding to the frame region of claims 1 and 8 of the present invention is the frame region 40 (in Fig. 5) described in the “081”. The “081” particularly points out that “a frame pattern 34 for shielding the edges of the display area from light is formed.. ..in the frame region 40” (see Fig. 5 and paragraph [0072]). Further, the frame pattern 34 is made of chromium (Cr) (see paragraph 97 lines 10-13). Therefore, in claims 1 and 8, at least one color layer is formed on the frame region. In contrast, in “081”, chromium is formed on the frame region. The claimed invention and the cited reference “081” use different materials for the frame region. Therefore the structure and the materials of a light-shielding frame for a liquid crystal display panel and the manufacturing method thereof, provided by the “081” is different from that of the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct and allowable over the art of record and respectfully requests the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 1 and 8 to be reconsidered and withdrawn. In addition, as claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11-13 and 17-19 depend from independent claim 1 and 8 respectively which are believed to be patentable and add further limitations thereto, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn as well.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the “081” reference in view of a prior art driving integrated circuit, and the Office Action rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “081” in view of a prior art chemical-mechanical polishing steps.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (MPEP §2143)

As stated above for claims 1 and 8 of the present application, the material of the color layer on the frame region is different from the pattern layer 34 in "081", and claims 6 and 14-16 respectively depend from claims 1 and 8. Therefore, the combinations proposed by the Office Action do not show all of the novel physical features of claims 6 and 14-16 as discussed above. That is, the novel features claims 6 and 14-16 produce new and unexpected results and hence are unobvious and patentable over the references.

Accordingly, the structure recited in claim 6 and the methods recited in claims 14-16 are not obvious over the "081" in view of the above-identified prior arts. Thus, the subject matter of claims 6 and 14-16 are nonobvious over "081". Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, Applicant submits that the entire specification including the claims are patentably distinguished over the art of record and are in proper form for grant. Applicant respectfully requests the early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

Date: _____

7/27/05

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Timothy J. Keefer
Reg. No. 35,567
Attorney for Applicant
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
55 E. Monroe St., Suite 4200
Chicago, IL 60603-5803
Telephone: (312) 269-8552
Facsimile: (312) 269-8869
e-mail: tkeefe@seyfarth.com